

## **EXHIBIT G**

**Subject:** RE: Response to interrogatory #1  
**From:** "Louis Alex" <lalex@cookalex.com>  
**Date:** Thu, 8 May 2008 17:01:21 -0500  
**To:** <robert@karton.us>, "Edward Manzo" <emanzo@cookalex.com>, "Steven Katz" <skatz@masudafunai.com>, "Nancy Sasamoto" <NSasamoto@masudafunai.com>, "George Kobayashi" <GKobayashi@masudafunai.com>, "Jason Smalley" <jsmalley@cookalex.com>  
**CC:** "Geoffrey Baker" <gabaker@dowellbaker.com>, "Vernon Francissen" <vern@francissenpatentlaw.com>

Dear Bob:

We would like to respond to the last point you bring up according to interrogatory No. 1. As we discussed during our Tuesday telephone conference call, we believe that this interrogatory, as written, is not clear. We believe it is more accurate to reword this interrogatory, changing certain portions of the suggestion made by Mr. Robert Karton, Esq., that a "short and to the point" response is required. This change suggests that our answer could be "bullet-pointed" and "to the point" of the question.

Following receipt of your request for "short and to the point" response, we will provide the following response. We trust this response will satisfy your request. We thank you for your cooperation and understanding of our desire to keep this communication confidential. Furthermore, you may contact us at this office if you have any questions or concerns about the preceding response.

...and the court room building that the information and benefit be classified on which the notifications are issued, regarding all the sources of the information on which the court room has been informed to grant the documents referred.

We believe that our emphasis on this "law of attorney-client privilege" and "to the point" resulting in providing only basic facts, may be appropriate, particularly for our clients who are not privy to the attorney-client privilege, in order to maintain the confidentiality of the information.

We also emphasize that, for your purposes, the client's attorney can distinguish between the information which is with respect to a particular party, or parties, and the information which is with respect to the other party. In this manner, the answer may begin, for interrogatory number six, response, as follows: "As defined, we agree that you may keep information concerning your position and strategy of the proposed litigation, and your legal strategy from being disclosed to third parties, except for your attorney and the attorney for the other party."

We again state our desire to work with you on this matter and encourage you to propose the agreement, with the parties agreeing to it, from your end, and our end, no later than Tuesday, May 13, 2008.

Sincerely,

L.A.

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Karton <robert@karton.us> [mailto:[robert@karton.us](mailto:robert@karton.us)] Sent: Friday, May 09, 2008 1:55 PM

To: Louis Alex <lalex@cookalex.com>; Steven Katz <skatz@masudafunai.com>

Cc: Geoffrey Baker <gabaker@dowellbaker.com>

Subject: RE: Response to Interrogatory #1

In view of what is known and anticipated, we propose the following:

1) We will respond to the interrogatory as follows:

1) and 2) is as the content of this point is already laid to paper in the form, and the last part is your standard

category provided prior to litigation, response, our office

will file and serve same on your behalf on or before May 13, 2008

to interrogatory.

Plaintiff has no personal knowledge of anything and nothing  
pertaining to Plaintiff's information and beliefs relating to or based on the  
plaintiff's attorney and/or the attorney that he or she appointed in  
accordance with the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiff will promptly  
make available to Plaintiff's attorney full and complete information pertaining to  
the attorney's information and beliefs he obtained or which he

has since received concerning Plaintiff's attorney's  
information and beliefs or how he obtained it and relevant  
and pertinent to Plaintiff's attorney's attorney and  
provided him with anything other than that which constitutes  
full and complete information and nothing less than full  
and complete. Such action is simply not acceptable.

Respectfully,

Robert M. Kerton, Ltd.

cc: Plaintiff's Attorney, Esq., Esq., Esq.

Case No. 1:08-cv-00526

Robert M. Kerton, Ltd.

(404) 522-6300 x 202

(404) 522-2311 x 202

(404) 522-2064 x 202

Scanned by Plaintiff's Attorney's Office Computer